



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/678,893  
Filing Date: October 02, 2003  
Appellant(s): CHANG ET AL.

---

Rodney M. Anderson  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7/4/2007 appealing from the Office action mailed 9/19/2006.

**(1) Real Party in Interest**

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) Related Appeals and Interferences**

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

**(3) Status of Claims**

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) Status of Amendments After Final**

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Mater**

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal**

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal identifies the ground of rejections and the associated claims under rejection to be reviewed on appeal.

**(7) Claims Appendix**

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

**(8) Evidence Relied Upon**

6,747,827	Bassett et al.	06-2004
2002/0032891	Yada et al.	03-2002

Art Unit: 2186

5,956,743	Bruce et al.	09-1999
-----------	--------------	---------

6,182,239	Kramer	01-2001
-----------	--------	---------

**(9) Grounds of Rejection*****Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

>>> Claims 4, 6-7, 9, 11, 16-17, 19, 21, 26, 28 and 31-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (US 6,747,827), and in view of Yada et al., US Patent Application Publication 2002/0032891).

As to claim 4, Bassett et al. disclose **a method for storing data within a non-volatile memory** [Error Correction Codes Applied Variably by Disk Zone, Track, Section, or Content (title); a disk is a type of non-volatile memory] **comprised of a plurality of blocks** [the storage device is a disk comprising a plurality of zones, tracks or sectors (title; column 4, lines 17-27)] **in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate** [the plurality of zones, tracks or sectors are formed in a single disk (title; column 4, lines 17-27); the aspect of "semiconductor substrate" is taught by Yada, see below], **each of the plurality of blocks having an indicator indicative of whether the block is a reclaimed block** [Bessett teaches that the ECC code to be applied to each of the block depends on an indicator that indicates the attributes associated with

Art Unit: 2186

the block (According to a preferred embodiment of the invention, the ECC encoder 40 can encode the data using more than one ECC. The ECC encoder 40 may, for example, provide two or more ECC coding strategies or algorithms by which the incoming data may be encoded. The selection of which particular strategy is used may depend upon a number of factors, below described in detail, depending, for example, on the radial location on the disk at which the data is to be written, the data type, and so on (column 3, lines 52-60)); Yada further teaches that each block has an indicator indicating whether a block is a reclaimed block, see below]; **the method comprising: identifying a first block of the plurality of blocks into which data is to be written** [for example, a given zone, track or sector (title; column 4, lines 17-27)]; **responsive to the indicator associated with the first block meeting a criterion, encoding the data using a first error detection algorithm** [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produces a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46); The method includes applying a first error correction code algorithm to a first set of

Art Unit: 2186

data to be written to the hard disk drive. A second error correction code algorithm, different from the first, is applied to a second set of data to be written to the hard disk drive. The first and second error correction code algorithms may for example produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to said data. The selection between the first and second algorithms may be made, for instance, in dependence upon the physical location on the hard disk drive to which the data is to be written, or in dependence upon the type of said data to be written (column 2, lines 15-26); According to a preferred embodiment of the invention, the ECC encoder 40 can encode the data using more than one ECC. The ECC encoder 40 may, for example, provide two or more ECC coding strategies or algorithms by which the incoming data may be encoded. The selection of which particular strategy is used may depend upon a number of factors, below described in detail, depending, for example, on the radial location on the disk at which the data is to be written, the data type, and so on (column 3, lines 52-60); According to a preferred embodiment of the invention, it is observed that the need for error correction in many applications depends on the frequency and duration of soft errors, which, in turn, may depend upon the radial position of a given sector. Thus, two of the salient aspects of the invention are the need for an ECC for the duration and, frequency of soft errors and the need for an ECC for a given radial location (column 4, lines 37-45)];

**then writing the encoded data into the first block** [When the data is written to the disk, the ECC bits are typically appended to the end of the sector and become an integral part of the data in the sector (column 2, lines 3-5)];

Art Unit: 2186

**identifying a second block of the plurality of blocks into which data is to be written** [for example, another given zone, track or sector (title; column 4, lines 17-27)]; **responsive to the indicator associated with the second block not meeting a criterion, encoding the data using a second error detection algorithm** [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produces a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46); The method includes applying a first error correction code algorithm to a first set of data to be written to the hard disk drive. A second error correction code algorithm, different from the first, is applied to a second set of data to be written to the hard disk drive. The first and second error correction code algorithms may for example produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to said data. The selection between the first and second algorithms may be made, for instance, in dependence upon the physical location on the hard disk drive to which the data is to be written, or in dependence upon the type of said data to be written (column 2, lines 15-26); According to a preferred embodiment of the invention,

Art Unit: 2186

the ECC encoder 40 can encode the data using more than one ECC. The ECC encoder 40 may, for example, provide two or more ECC coding strategies or algorithms by which the incoming data may be encoded. The selection of which particular strategy is used may depend upon a number of factors, below described in detail, depending, for example, on the radial location on the disk at which the data is to be written, the data type, and so on (column 3, lines 52-60); According to a preferred embodiment of the invention, it is observed that the need for error correction in many applications depends on the frequency and duration of soft errors, which, in turn, may depend upon the radial position of a given sector. Thus, two of the salient aspects of the invention are the need for an ECC for the duration and, frequency of soft errors and the need for an ECC for a given radial location (column 4, lines 37-45);

**the second error detection algorithm having a higher error detection capability than the first error detection algorithm** [for example, the ECC strategies may be selected to use more ECC bits in association with the data located toward the outer radii 76 and fewer ECC bits in association with data located toward the inner radii 78 (column 6, lines 21-24)]; **and**

**then writing the encoded data into the first block** [When the data is written to the disk, the ECC bits are typically appended to the end of the sector and become an integral part of the data in the sector (column 2, lines 3-5)];

Regarding claim 4, the invention disclosed by Bassett et al. is applied toward a disk, which may or may not be formed in a semiconductor substrate. Also, Bassett does not teach that the indicator is indicative of whether the block is a reclaimed block.

However, the method disclosed by Bassett et al. is equally applicable to a plurality of blocks of memory formed in a semiconductor substrate, because ECC codes are equally applicable to disk-based memory as well as semiconductor-based memory.

Further, Yada et al. disclose in their invention "Data processing System and Data Processing Method" a method of applying different ECC algorithms to different blocks of a flash memory array that is formed on a semiconductor substrate [figure 3(A)~3(D) show the configuration of the flash memory array formed on a semiconductor substrate; The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031); According to the above, the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite

Art Unit: 2186

assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Moreover, Yada teaches that each block is associated with an indicator indicative whether a block is a reclaimed block [According to the above, the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); here the Examiner interprets “a reclaimed block” as “a reused block.” Yada teaches that each block/area is associated with an indicator indicative of if and how frequently a block/area has been reused through rewriting].

It is further noted that the inventions of both Bassett et al. and Yada et al. are directed toward applying different ECC algorithms to different blocks of memory according to the attributes of each block so that the overhead associated with the ECC code can be reduced and the memory space can be used more efficiently [Bassett (abstract; column 1, lines 50-64); Yada (abstract; paragraphs 0029-0030)]. The invention of Bassett et al. is directed toward disk-based memory while the invention of Yada et al. is directed to memory based on semiconductor substrate.

Memory based on semiconductor substrate has at least the advantage in terms of the size when compared to memory based on disk, and can be made of a single chip [Yada, paragraph 0031].

Art Unit: 2186

Providing an indicator indicative of whether a block is a reclaimed block and how many times the block has been reused is critical in determining the performance and reliability of a block, as Yada et al teach that the performance of a flash memory is degraded with an increase in the number of rewriting [paragraphs 0002 and 0005], and would necessitate the applying of a ECC code to mitigate the degradation [paragraph 0004].

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to combine the teachings from Bassett et al. and Yada et al. to apply suitable ECC code to each block/area of a semiconductor-based memory system, with an indicator indicative of whether a block is a reclaimed block and how many times the block has been reused, in order to improve the performance and reliability of the memory and to take advantage of the size benefit of a semiconductor-based memory.

As to claim 6, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 4, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 4. Refer to "As to claim 4" presented earlier in this Office Action. Further, Yada et al. that **the indicator has a value indicative of a number of times the block has been erased** [Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); an electrically erasable and programmable non-volatile memory such as a flash memory ... (paragraph 0002); thus, as writing/erasing for the flash memory is repeatedly don... (paragraph 0005); the flash memory needs to be erased first before it

Art Unit: 2186

can be rewritten/reprogrammed again. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between “the number of erasing” and “the number of rewriting/reprogramming,” and the frequency of rewriting is indicative of the frequency of erasing].

As to claim 7, Yada et al. that **the indicator has a value indicative of an approximately average number of times the blocks within the non-volatile memory has been erased** [Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029)].

As to claim 9, Yada et al. teach that **the non-volatile memory is a flash memory** [figure 3(A)~3(D) show the configuration of the flash memory array formed on a semiconductor substrate; The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

As to claim 11, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 6” presented earlier in this Office Action. Further, it is understood in the art that the same error detection algorithm must be used for encoding and decoding to be able to recover the original data correctly.

As to claim 16, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 6” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 17, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 7, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 7. Refer to “As to claim 7” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 19, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 9, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 9. Refer to “As to claim 9” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 21, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 1, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 1. Refer to “As to claim 1” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 26, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 6” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 28, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 11, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 11. Refer to “As to claim 11” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 31, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 4, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 4. Refer to “As to claim 4” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 32, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 6” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 33, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 6” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 38, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 6” presented earlier in this Office Action.

>>> Claims 3, 13, 23 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (US 6,747,827), in view of Yada et al., US Patent Application Publication 2002/0032891), and further in view of Applicants’ admission of prior art.

As to claims 3, 13, 23 and 30, Bassett et al. in view of Yada et al. does not explicitly mention that **the first algorithm is a 1-bit error correction code (ECC) algorithm and the second algorithm is a 2-bit ECC algorithm.**

However, 1-bit and 2-bit ECC are well known in the art, as evident by any textbook on the subject of error correction coding.

Further, figure 4 of Yada et al. shows a table of ECC with various number of ECC bits that may be used, depending the desired correcting capability,

Moreover, Applicants admit in the “Background of the Invention” section of their disclosure that both the 1-bit and 2-bit ECC algorithms are well known in the art (paragraph 0009).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to recognize that both the 1-bit and 2-bit ECC algorithms are well known in the art, as admitted by Applicants, hence lacking patentable significance.

>>> Claims 9-10, 19-20, 27 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (US 6,747,827), in view of Yada et al., US Patent Application Publication 2002/0032891), and further in view of Kramer (US 6,182,239).

As to claims 9-10, 19-20, 27 and 34, Bassett et al. in view of Yada et al. does not explicitly mention that **the non-volatile memory is a flash memory, and particularly, one of a NAND flash memory and an MLC NAND flash memory.**

However, the inventions of both Bassett et al. and Yada et al. are directly applicable to any type of flash memories, including NAND flash memory and MLC NAND flash memory.

Further, Kramer teaches in the invention "Fault-Tolerant Codes for Multi-Level Memories" a fault-tolerant code semiconductor flash memory storage devices including an array of individual multi-level cell (MLC) storage devices [abstract; column 2, lines 1-15] as well as NAND flash memory [column 2, lines 36-57].

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to recognize that the particular limitation recited in this claim is well known in the art, as demonstrated Kramer, hence lacking patentable significance.

Art Unit: 2186

>>> Claims 7, 8 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bassett et al. (US 6,747,827), in view of Yada et al., US Patent Application Publication 2002/0032891), and further in view of Bruce et al. (US 5,956,743).

As to claims 7, 8 and 18, Yada et al. teach that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and [paragraph 0012] and that Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas [paragraph 0029]. But Bassett in view of Yada does not explicitly teach the data structure uses to store the indicator.

Further, Bruce et al. teach in their invention "Transparent Management at Host Interface of Flash-memory Overhead-Bytes Using Flash-Specific DMA Having Programmable Processor-Interrupt of High-Level Operations" a block management and replacement scheme for wear-leveling using ECC as part of the overhead bytes in a flash-memory chips [abstract] in which dual write counters are allocated to each of the block to indicate how many times a block has been erased and written (i.e., reclaimed) [column 1, lines 57-67].

Using erase/write counters as indicators to support wear-leveling operations increases the life expectancy of a non-volatile memory device such as flash memory chip.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skills in the art at the time of Applicants' invention to recognize that benefit of using erase/write counters as

Art Unit: 2186

indicators to support wear-leveling operation, as demonstrated Bruce et al., and to incorporate it into the existing scheme disclosed by Bassett et al. and Yada et al. to further improve the life expectancy of the non-volatile memory devices.

As to claim 7, Bruce et al. teach that **the indicator is arranged to indicate an approximately average number of times blocks within the non-volatile memory have been erased** [dual write counters are allocated to each of the block to indicate how many times a block has been erased and written (i.e., reclaimed) (column 1, lines 57-67)].

As to claim 8, Bruce et al. teach that **the indicator is stored in a data structure, the data structure being substantially separate from the first block, and obtaining the indicator associated with the block includes obtaining the indicator from the data structure** [the data structure is the dual write counters that are allocated to each of the block to indicate how many times a block has been erased and written (i.e., reclaimed) (column 1, lines 57-67)].

As to claim 17, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 7, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 7. Refer to “As to claim 7” presented earlier in this Office Action.

As to claim 18, it recites substantially the same limitations as in claim 6, and is rejected based on the same reasons set forth in claim 6. Refer to “As to claim 4” presented earlier in this Office Action.

## **(10) Response to Arguments**

Appellants' arguments have been fully and carefully considered with Examiner's answers set forth below.

**Response to Argument on Claim 4 and its dependent claim 3**

Appellants contend that Bassett in view of Yada fails to teach the existence of an indicator, associated with a block of non-volatile memory, that is indicative of whether that block is a reclaimed block, much less than select an error detection algorithm responsive to this indicator. The Examiner disagrees.

First, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting an error detection algorithm for each of a plurality of regions based on attributes associated with each region.

Bessett teaches that [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46)].

The Examiner acknowledges that Bessett's invention is directed to a storage disk, which may not be a semiconductor substrate [refer to page 7 of the Final Rejection

Art Unit: 2186

mailed on 9/19/2006]. However, the aspect of semiconductor substrate is taught by Yada [The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, as for the indication of whether a block/sector/region is “a reclaimed block,” it is noted that the citing of “a reclaimed block” only appears as part of preamble stating the purpose and intended use of claim 4, and the context of the body of the claim does not even refer to “a reclaimed block” at all. As such, the element “a reclaimed block” does not carry weight and is not to be considered when determining its patentability with respect to prior art. See MPEP 2111.02 [R-3], “Effect of Preamble,” Section II.

Even if the element “a reclaimed block” is to be considered as a claim limitation, it is taught by reference Yada anyway. Here the Examiner interprets “a reclaimed block”

Art Unit: 2186

as “a reused block,” and Yada teaches that the selection of a particular ECC method depends on the frequency of reuse of a memory block [the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029)].

Thus, Yada clearly teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is an area that is subjected to high frequency of “reuse” via “rewriting” of certain data while “other storage areas” is subjected to low frequency of “reuse,” and the application of ECC codes depends on which area is under consideration. The frequency of reuse is certainly an indication of how often a block/area is being reused.

Appellants also contend that the “frequently-rewritten” modifier only applies to the “nature of the data” and does not applied to “the destination block.” The Examiner disagrees.

First, Yada teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is used to store “Frequently-rewritten parameter data” and “other storage areas” are used to store “program data or the like low in rewriting frequency.” In other words, the characteristics of an area is taken into consideration to match up with the nature of data [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the

Art Unit: 2186

characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, using the common practice of “recycling” material as an analogy, “glass/plastic/aluminum objects” are placed into “a designated recycle bin” while “trash” goes into “a garbage can.” Thus, there is a direct correspondence between “the nature of the objects/data” and “the nature of the bin/can/storage areas,” or, to state it in another way, “the nature of the objects/data” is also a direct reflection, or an indication, of the nature of the corresponding “storage areas.” After all, it is only normal to deposit “valuable jewelry” in “a safety box” and to place “trash” in “a garbage can,” and not the other way around.

Appellants also contend that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings from Bessett and Yada. The Examiner disagrees.

As presented earlier, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area. Thus, they share the same common goal of efficiently applying ECC code to a region/area of memory storage space in order to minimize the overhead associated with the ECC code. Therefore, persons of ordinary skills in the art interested in solving the common problem of “selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of

Art Unit: 2186

regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area” would have combined the teachings from Bassett and Yada to tailor their unique needs, be it on a semiconductor substrate or on a disk.

Therefore, Bassett in view of Yada indeed teach all the limitations recited in claim 4. As such, the Examiner’s position regarding the patentability of claim 4 and its dependent claim 3 remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

**Response to Argument on Claim 6 and its dependent claims 7-11 and 13**

Independent claim 6 recites substantially the same limitations as independent claim 4, with the difference in that “the indicator” in claim 6 “has a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased,” instead of being “indicative of whether the block is a reclaimed block” as recited in claim 4.

Appellants again contend that Bassett in view of Yada fails to teach the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate, much less responsive to an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased. The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner will address the aspect of “the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate” to being with.

First, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting an error detection algorithm for each of a plurality of regions based on attributes associated with each region.

Bessett teaches that [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46)].

The Examiner acknowledges that Bessett's invention is directed to a storage disk, which may not be a semiconductor substrate [refer to page 7 of the Final Rejection mailed on 9/19/2006]. However, the aspect of semiconductor substrate is taught by Yada [The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be

Art Unit: 2186

determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, as for the aspect of “according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate,” Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Thus, Yada clearly teaches “paying attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory.” Note that “characteristics” of individual memory cell is the corresponding “attributes” of a memory cell.

Third, as for the aspect of “an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased,” Yada teaches the selection of a particular ECC method depends on the frequency of reuse of a memory block [the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); the present invention has a first storage area (20Bb) low in the number of rewrite assurances, and a second storage area (20Ba) high in the number of rewrite assurances (paragraph 0042)].

Further, Yada’s invention is directed toward a flash memory, and a flash memory needs to be erased first before it can be rewritten again [an electrically erasable and programmable non-volatile memory such as a flash memory ... (paragraph 0002); thus, as writing/erasing for the flash memory is repeatedly done... (paragraph 0005)]. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between “the number of erasing” and “the number of rewriting,” and the frequency of rewriting is indicative of the frequency of erasing.

It is noted that, by definition, “the frequency” of any event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) is derived directly from “the number of occurrence” of that event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) over a period of time. Therefore, the frequency of reuse of a block serves as an indication of the number of times the block is erased as far as a flash memory is concerned.

Art Unit: 2186

Appellants again contend that the “frequently-rewritten” modifier only applies to the “nature of the data” and does not apply to “the destination block.” The Examiner disagrees.

First, Yada teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is used to store “Frequently-rewritten parameter data” and “other storage areas” are used to store “program data or the like low in rewriting frequency.” In other words, the characteristics of an area is taken into consideration to match up with the nature of data [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, using the common practice of “recycling” material as an analogy, “glass/plastic/aluminum objects” are placed into “a designated recycle bin” while “trash” goes into “a garbage can.” Thus, there is a direct correspondence between “the nature of the objects/data” and “the nature of the bin/can/storage areas,” or, to state it in another way, “the nature of the objects/data” is also a direct reflection, or an indication, of the nature of the corresponding “storage areas.” After all, it is only normal to deposit

Art Unit: 2186

“valuable jewelry” in “a safety box” and to place “trash” in “a garbage can,” and not the other way around.

Appellants also contend that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings from Bessett and Yada. The Examiner disagrees.

As presented earlier, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area. Thus, they share the same common goal of efficiently applying ECC code to a region/area of memory storage space in order to minimize the overhead associated with the ECC code. Therefore, persons of ordinary skills in the art interested in solving the common problem of “selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area” would have combined the teachings from Bassett and Yada to tailor their unique needs, be it on a semiconductor substrate or on a disk.

Therefore, Bessett in view of Yada indeed teach all the limitations recited in claim 6. As such, the Examiner’s position regarding the patentability of claim 6 and all its dependent claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

**Response to Argument on Claim 16 and its dependent claims 17-20**

Independent claim 16 recites substantially the same limitations as independent claim 6, with both of them citing, besides other limitations, “an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased.”

Appellants once again contend that Bassett in view of Yada fails to teach the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate, much less responsive to an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased. The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner will address the aspect of “the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate” to being with.

First, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting an error detection algorithm for each of a plurality of regions based on attributes associated with each region.

Bessett teaches that [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46)].

Art Unit: 2186

The Examiner acknowledges that Bessett's invention is directed to a storage disk, which may not be a semiconductor substrate [refer to page 7 of the Final Rejection mailed on 9/19/2006]. However, the aspect of semiconductor substrate is taught by Yada [The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, as for the aspect of "according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate," Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each

Art Unit: 2186

memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Thus, Yada clearly teaches “paying attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory.” Note that “characteristics” of individual memory cell is the corresponding “attributes” of a memory cell.

Third, as for the aspect of “an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased,” Yada teaches the selection of a particular ECC method depends on the frequency of reuse of a memory block [the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); the present invention has a first storage area (20Bb) low in the number of rewrite assurances, and a second storage area (20Ba) high in the number of rewrite assurances (paragraph 0042)].

Further, Yada’s invention is directed toward a flash memory, and a flash memory needs to be erased first before it can be rewritten again [an electrically erasable and programmable non-volatile memory such as a flash memory ... (paragraph 0002); thus,

Art Unit: 2186

as writing/erasing for the flash memory is repeatedly done... (paragraph 0005)]. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between “the number of erasing” and “the number of rewriting,” and the frequency of rewriting is indicative of the frequency of erasing.

It is noted that, by definition, “the frequency” of any event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) is derived directly from “the number of occurrence” of that event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) over a period of time. Therefore, the frequency of reuse of a block serves as an indication of the number of times the block is erased as far as a flash memory is concerned.

Appellants again contend that the “frequently-rewritten” modifier only applies to the “nature of the data” and does not applied to “the destination block.” The Examiner disagrees.

First, Yada teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is used to store “Frequently-rewritten parameter data” and “other storage areas” are used to store “program data or the like low in rewriting frequency.” In other words, the characteristics of an area is taken into consideration to match up with the nature of data [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite

Art Unit: 2186

assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, using the common practice of “recycling” material as an analogy, “glass/plastic/aluminum objects” are placed into “a designated recycle bin” while “trash” goes into “a garbage can.” Thus, there is a direct correspondence between “the nature of the objects/data” and “the nature of the bin/can/storage areas,” or, to state it in another way, “the nature of the objects/data” is also a direct reflection, or an indication, of the nature of the corresponding “storage areas.” After all, it is only normal to deposit “valuable jewelry” in “a safety box” and to place “trash” in “a garbage can,” and not the other way around.

Appellants also contend that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings from Bassett and Yada. The Examiner disagrees.

As presented earlier, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area. Thus, they share the same common goal of efficiently applying ECC code to a region/area of memory storage space in order to minimize the overhead associated with the ECC code. Therefore, persons of ordinary skills in the art interested in solving the common problem of “selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area” would have combined the teachings from Bassett and Yada to tailor their unique needs, be it on a semiconductor substrate or on a disk.

Therefore, Bassett in view of Yada indeed teach all the limitations recited in claim 16. As such, the Examiner's position regarding the patentability of claim 16 and all its dependent claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

**Response to Argument on Claim 21 and its dependent claims 23 and 27-32**

Independent claim 21 recites substantially the same limitations as independent claim 4, with both of them citing, besides other limitations, "an indicator having a value indicative of whether a block is a reclaimed block."

Appellants contend that Bassett in view of Yada fails to teach the existence of an indicator, associated with a block of non-volatile memory, that is indicative of whether that block is a reclaimed block, much less than select an error detection algorithm responsive to this indicator. The Examiner disagrees.

First, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting an error detection algorithm for each of a plurality of regions based on attributes associated with each region.

Bassett teaches that [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second

Art Unit: 2186

error correction code algorithms preferably produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46)].

The Examiner acknowledges that Bessett's invention is directed to a storage disk, which may not be a semiconductor substrate [refer to page 7 of the Final Rejection mailed on 9/19/2006]. However, the aspect of semiconductor substrate is taught by Yada [The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, as for the indication of whether a block/sector/region is a reclaimed block, the Examiner interprets "a reclaimed block" as "a reused block," and Yada teaches that the selection of a particular ECC method depends on the frequency of reuse of a memory block [the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data

Art Unit: 2186

stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object.

Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029)].

Thus, Yada clearly teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is an area that is subjected to high frequency of “reuse” via “rewriting” of certain data while “other storage areas” is subjected to low frequency of “reuse,” and the application of ECC codes depends on which area is under consideration. The frequency of reuse is certainly an indication of how often a block/area is being reused.

Appellants also contend that the “frequently-rewritten” modifier only applies to the “nature of the data” and does not applied to “the destination block.” The Examiner disagrees.

First, Yada teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is used to store “Frequently-rewritten parameter data” and “other storage areas” are used to store “program data or the like low in rewriting frequency.” In other words, the characteristics of an area is taken into consideration to match up with the nature of data [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite

Art Unit: 2186

assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, using the common practice of “recycling” material as an analogy, “glass/plastic/aluminum objects” are placed into “a designated recycle bin” while “trash” goes into “a garbage can.” Thus, there is a direct correspondence between “the nature of the objects/data” and “the nature of the bin/can/storage areas,” or, to state it in another way, “the nature of the objects/data” is also a direct reflection, or an indication, of the nature of the corresponding “storage areas.” After all, it is only normal to deposit “valuable jewelry” in “a safety box” and to place “trash” in “a garbage can,” and not the other way around.

Appellants also contend that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings from Bassett and Yada. The Examiner disagrees.

As presented earlier, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area. Thus, they share the same common goal of efficiently applying ECC code to a region/area of memory storage space in order to minimize the overhead associated with the ECC code. Therefore, persons of ordinary skills in the art interested in solving the common problem of “selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area” would have combined the teachings from Bassett and Yada to tailor their unique needs, be it on a semiconductor substrate or on a disk.

Therefore, Bessett in view of Yada indeed teach all the limitations recited in claim 21. As such, the Examiner's position regarding the patentability of claim 21 and its dependent claim 3 remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

**Response to Argument on Claim 26**

Independent claim 26 recites substantially the same limitations as independent claims 6 and 16, with all of them citing, besides other limitations, "an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased."

Appellants once more contend that Bassett in view of Yada fails to teach the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate, much less responsive to an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased. The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner will address the aspect of "the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate" to being with.

First, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting an error detection algorithm for each of a plurality of regions based on attributes associated with each region.

Bessett teaches that [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7,

Art Unit: 2186

lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46)].

The Examiner acknowledges that Bessett's invention is directed to a storage disk, which may not be a semiconductor substrate [refer to page 7 of the Final Rejection mailed on 9/19/2006]. However, the aspect of semiconductor substrate is taught by Yada [The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, as for the aspect of “according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate,” Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Thus, Yada clearly teaches “paying attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory.” Note that “characteristics” of individual memory cell is the corresponding “attributes” of a memory cell.

Third, as for the aspect of “an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased,” Yada teaches the selection of a particular ECC method depends on the frequency of reuse of a memory block [the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the

Art Unit: 2186

specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); the present invention has a first storage area (20Bb) low in the number of rewrite assurances, and a second storage area (20Ba) high in the number of rewrite assurances (paragraph 0042)].

Further, Yada's invention is directed toward a flash memory, and a flash memory needs to be erased first before it can be rewritten again [an electrically erasable and programmable non-volatile memory such as a flash memory ... (paragraph 0002); thus, as writing/erasing for the flash memory is repeatedly done... (paragraph 0005)]. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between "the number of erasing" and "the number of rewriting," and the frequency of rewriting is indicative of the frequency of erasing.

It is noted that, by definition, "the frequency" of any event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) is derived directly from "the number of occurrence" of that event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) over a period of time. Therefore, the frequency of reuse of a block serves as an indication of the number of times the block is erased as far as a flash memory is concerned.

Appellants again contend that the "frequently-rewritten" modifier only applies to the "nature of the data" and does not applied to "the destination block." The Examiner disagrees.

First, Yada teaches that "the specified partial storage area" is used to store "Frequently-rewritten parameter data" and "other storage areas" are used to store "program data or the like low in rewriting frequency." In other words, the characteristics

Art Unit: 2186

of an area is taken into consideration to match up with the nature of data [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, using the common practice of “recycling” material as an analogy, “glass/plastic/aluminum objects” are placed into “a designated recycle bin” while “trash” goes into “a garbage can.” Thus, there is a direct correspondence between “the nature of the objects/data” and “the nature of the bin/can/storage areas,” or, to state it in another way, “the nature of the objects/data” is also a direct reflection, or an indication, of the nature of the corresponding “storage areas.” After all, it is only normal to deposit “valuable jewelry” in “a safety box” and to place “trash” in “a garbage can,” and not the other way around.

Appellants also contend that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings from Bessett and Yada. The Examiner disagrees.

As presented earlier, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area. Thus, they share

Art Unit: 2186

the same common goal of efficiently applying ECC code to a region/area of memory storage space in order to minimize the overhead associated with the ECC code.

Therefore, persons of ordinary skills in the art interested in solving the common problem of “selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area” would have combined the teachings from Bassett and Yada to tailor their unique needs, be it on a semiconductor substrate or on a disk.

Therefore, Bassett in view of Yada indeed teach all the limitations recited in claim 26. As such, the Examiner’s position regarding the patentability of claim 26 and all its dependent claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

**Response to Argument on Claim 33 and its dependent claim 34**

Independent claim 33 recites substantially the same limitations as independent claims 6, 16 and 26, with all of them citing, besides other limitations, “an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased.”

Appellants again contend that Bassett in view of Yada fails to teach the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate, much less responsive to an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased. The Examiner disagrees.

The Examiner will address the aspect of “the encoding of data according to a first or a second error detection algorithm, of different error capacity, according to any

Art Unit: 2186

attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate” to being with.

First, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting an error detection algorithm for each of a plurality of regions based on attributes associated with each region.

Bessett teaches that [For example, different error correcting codes of different strengths may be applied on a sector-by-sector basis, or on some other basis, depending upon the particular application, data types involved, and so forth (column 7, lines 29-33); the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the physical location of said data on said hard disk drive. In another embodiment, the error correction selection criterion selects which of said first and second algorithms is to be applied in dependence upon the type of said data to be written to the disk. The first and second error correction code algorithms preferably produce a different number of error correction code bits for application to the data (column 2, lines 37-46)].

The Examiner acknowledges that Bessett's invention is directed to a storage disk, which may not be a semiconductor substrate [refer to page 7 of the Final Rejection mailed on 9/19/2006]. However, the aspect of semiconductor substrate is taught by Yada [The data processing system can be implemented as a single chip type microcomputer wherein the non-volatile memory and the central processing unit are formed on a single semiconductor chip (paragraph 0031)].

Art Unit: 2186

Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, as for the aspect of “according to any attribute of the destination block in an array formed on a semiconductor substrate,” Yada teaches that [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Thus, Yada clearly teaches “paying attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have found out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be

Art Unit: 2186

determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory.” Note that “characteristics” of individual memory cell is the corresponding “attributes” of a memory cell.

Third, as for the aspect of “an indicator having a value indicative of a number of times the first block has been erased,” Yada teaches the selection of a particular ECC method depends on the frequency of reuse of a memory block [the addition of ECC codes and an error correction are performed to increase the number of rewrite assurances with only an access to data stored in a specified partial storage area of a non-volatile memory as an object. Frequently-rewritten parameter data is stored in the specified partial storage area, and program data or the like low in rewriting frequency are stored in other storage areas (paragraph 0029); the present invention has a first storage area (20Bb) low in the number of rewrite assurances, and a second storage area (20Ba) high in the number of rewrite assurances (paragraph 0042)].

Further, Yada’s invention is directed toward a flash memory, and a flash memory needs to be erased first before it can be rewritten again [an electrically erasable and programmable non-volatile memory such as a flash memory ... (paragraph 0002); thus, as writing/erasing for the flash memory is repeatedly done... (paragraph 0005)]. Thus there is a one-to-one correspondence between “the number of erasing” and “the number of rewriting,” and the frequency of rewriting is indicative of the frequency of erasing.

It is noted that, by definition, “the frequency” of any event (e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) is derived directly from “the number of occurrence” of that event

Art Unit: 2186

(e.g., reuse/erase/rewrite) over a period of time. Therefore, the frequency of reuse of a block serves as an indication of the number of times the block is erased as far as a flash memory is concerned.

Appellants again contend that the “frequently-rewritten” modifier only applies to the “nature of the data” and does not applied to “the destination block.” The Examiner disagrees.

First, Yada teaches that “the specified partial storage area” is used to store “Frequently-rewritten parameter data” and “other storage areas” are used to store “program data or the like low in rewriting frequency.” In other words, the characteristics of an area is taken into consideration to match up with the nature of data [The present inventors have paid attention to the difference between the individual memory cell characteristics and thereby have fount out utility in that the number of bits of ECC codes corresponding to the number of data bits can be determined according to the characteristic of the flash memory. In short, the present inventors have found out utility in that the selection of an ECC method matched with a device characteristic of each memory cell is enabled or allowed to obtain a predetermined number of rewrite assurances, and overhead of each ECC code for the data is reduced, whereby the use efficiency of the storage area is set to the maximum (paragraph 0012)].

Second, using the common practice of “recycling” material as an analogy, “glass/plastic/aluminum objects” are placed into “a designated recycle bin” while “trash” goes into “a garbage can.” Thus, there is a direct correspondence between “the nature of the objects/data” and “the nature of the bin/can/storage areas,” or, to state it in

Art Unit: 2186

another way, “the nature of the objects/data” is also a direct reflection, or an indication, of the nature of the corresponding “storage areas.” After all, it is only normal to deposit “valuable jewelry” in “a safety box” and to place “trash” in “a garbage can,” and not the other way around.

Appellants also contend that there is no suggestion to combine the teachings from Bessett and Yada. The Examiner disagrees.

As presented earlier, the inventions of both Bassett and Yada are directed to selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area. Thus, they share the same common goal of efficiently applying ECC code to a region/area of memory storage space in order to minimize the overhead associated with the ECC code. Therefore, persons of ordinary skills in the art interested in solving the common problem of “selecting a suitable error detection algorithm (ECC) for each of a plurality of regions/areas based on attributes associated with each region/area” would have combined the teachings from Bassett and Yada to tailor their unique needs, be it on a semiconductor substrate or on a disk.

Therefore, Bessett in view of Yada indeed teach all the limitations recited in claim 33. As such, the Examiner’s position regarding the patentability of claim 33 and all its dependent claims remains the same as stated in the previous Office Action.

#### **(11) Related Proceedings Appendix**

There are no decisions rendered by a court or the Board that may directly affect, be affected by, or have a bearing on the decision of the Board in the instant appeal.

Art Unit: 2186

/Sheng-Jen Tsai/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2186
/Matt Kim/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2186
/Kevin L Ellis/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2117

August 25, 2009